

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

**FLAVIUS N. EURISTHE and
KIMILA S. EURISTHE,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**WILLIAM P. BECKMANN,
et al.,**

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

No. 4:23-cv-00653-O-BP

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge made Findings, Conclusions, and a Recommendation in this case. Given that the Plaintiffs seek emergency relief in the form of a Temporary Restraining Order (ECF No. 5), the Court has expedited review of the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation. No objections were filed. Therefore, the District Judge reviewed the proposed Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation for plain error. Finding none, the undersigned District Judge believes that the Findings and Conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct, and they are accepted as the Findings and Conclusions of the Court.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' request for a temporary restraining order is **DENIED**. However, given this Court's expedited review of the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Conclusions, Plaintiffs may still file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy of the Magistrate Judge's Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(1). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendation where

the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Services Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc).

SO ORDERED this **30th day of June, 2023**.


Reed O'Connor
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE